

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of March 24, 2004 is gratefully acknowledged.


Claims 1- 11 have been examined and rejected as follows: 1) claims 1 and 3 as anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Roth et al; 2) claims 2 and 6 - 9 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Roth; 3) claims 4 and 5 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Roth in view of Belenkly et al; 4) claim 10 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Roth in view of Kalomiris; and 5) claim 11 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Roth in view of Ngo.

To expedite prosecution, applicants have combined claims 1 and 2 by amending claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 2, while canceling claim 2. Appropriate amendments have been made to claims 6 and 11. This amendment to the claims obviates the rejection noted in 1). The remaining rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Roth patent forms the basis of the rejections noted in 2) - 5), and it is noted that Roth does not disclose a plate spring as recited in claim 2, and now claim 1 as amended. The plate spring functions as a positioning spring for securing the positional stability of a plug inserted into the insertion space. It also functions as a grounding contact for removing static electricity with which the plug may be charged. We find no such teaching in Roth nor the other patents of record. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that claim 1 as now amended and claims 3-11 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 as amended should be allowed over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 1 and 3-11 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Felix I. D' Ambrosio
Reg. No. 25,721

June 24, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane
4th Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314-1176
(703) 683-0500